

The Western Seminary Bulletin

REFORMED CHURCH IN AMERICA

VOL. VIII, NO. 2

HOLLAND, MICHIGAN

SEPTEMBER, 1954

The Evanston Assembly

D. IVAN DYKSTRA

LIBRARY
WESTERN THEO. SEMINARY
HOLLAND, MICHIGAN

The Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches was, by any reckoning, a very significant event in the history of the Christian church. Enough has been written about the assembly, both prior to and during the time it was in session and both in the secular press and the church press, to justify the assumption that by now the average churchman is pretty well informed, at least concerning the more or less external facts. There remains now the important and challenging task of trying to assess the full significance of what transpired at Evanston.

It would be preposterous to suppose that such an assessment could be given within the compass of one brief essay. The Assembly was almost frightening in its dimensions. It addressed itself to so many and such large issues that no one could ever feel that he had quite managed to grasp its full significance. Here it is necessary to select only one or two items and attempt to consider the significance of the Assembly through their particular perspectives.

Fortunately, those who were not present at the Assembly are not wholly dependent upon articles about the Assembly as they seek to be informed about it. No articles about it can be a substitute for having been present. Nor can articles about the Assembly be a substitute for a study of the documents which emerge from the Assembly itself. Papers on the main theme, as well as papers on each of the six sub-topics, are being commended to the churches for their study. This article will have achieved its objective if it succeeds in providing some glimpse into the meaning of the Assembly and of the World Council and in stimulating sufficient interest to lead many to a study of the official reports themselves. It is no exaggeration to say that the Assembly taken by itself is not of the greatest importance. It will become important to the extent that its reports become a stimulus to serious thinking by Christians everywhere.

The Assembly was a landmark in the life of the churches. But, important as it was, its significance cannot be understood or appreciated apart from some understanding of the real nature of the World Council of Churches which convened it. This paper, therefore, falls into two parts. The first is an attempt to suggest what were some of the meanings of the Assembly itself. The second is an attempt at analysis of the nature of the World Council, with more particular attention to the conception of church unity which it represents.

I

The Assembly was significant in several ways. In the first place, it was not without significance that the

Christian churches in this modern time could sponsor a gathering that commanded more attention than almost any other gathering of any kind in the history of the world. That aspect of the Evanston meeting should neither be over-estimated nor under-estimated. There is, on the one hand, need to be cautioned against supposing that the state of Christianity is to be measured simply in terms of the volume of the press coverage given to the Assembly, or that Christianity consists in or depends on the bigness of its assemblies. It is appropriate that the churches still in our time keep clearly in mind the ancient caution: "not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord." On the other hand there are other things to keep in mind. It will do the Christian cause no harm to catch just a glimpse of the fact that it is not some decadent movement lodged somewhere in the backwaters of the contemporary world, seeking grimly to postpone as long as it can the day of its demise. More important is the fact that the size of the popular response to the Evanston Assembly is a measure of modern man's awareness that he needs a revitalized Christian faith to enable him to live meaningfully in his complex world. It was sobering to realize that so many people were looking with such eager interest to Evanston for some new affirmation of the Christian hope. Under those circumstances the church is driven to ask with new seriousness how well she is meeting her opportunity in these days and fulfilling her responsibility to be faithful to her redemptive mission.

In the second place, the holding of the Assembly was the actual immediate stimulus to a fresh surge of significant Christian self-examination, in much the same way as the fact that he is called to preach a sermon next Sunday morning is the prod that stimulates the preacher to do some intensive praying and thinking about what God would say to this particular congregation in this particular day. So an Assembly was announced, and the fact that the Assembly was to be held meant that there was to be some witness to the will of God for this hour; and that, in turn meant that the churches were driven back to searching with special diligence into the authentic resources of their life and faith. The simple fact is that the necessity of preparing for the Assembly was the occasion for a fresh rethinking of the Christian gospel, with the churches working together, and that such rethinking would probably not have taken place without such a stimulus. This kind of thing, of course, is constantly going on whenever and wherever preachers are called upon to preach. But such preaching by virtue of its sheer repetitiousness be-

The Western Seminary Bulletin

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY
UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE
FACULTY OF THE SEMINARY
HOLLAND, MICHIGAN

EDITORIAL BOARD

LESTER J. KUYPER	ELTON EENIGENBURG
Faculty Representatives	
HENRY A. MOUW	D. IVAN DYKSTRA
Alumni Representatives	
CHARLES J. WISSINK	PAUL R. MEYERINK
Student Representatives	



comes a routine and can lose its perspective on the gospel. In our time, at least, nothing has contributed more directly or more significantly to the recovery of that Christian perspective than have the Assemblies of the World Council.

In the third place, in the Assembly the world-wide Christian fellowship became concrete in a unique way. The fellowship did not begin or end with the Assembly. Those two weeks at Evanston, however, were a focus and concrete realization of that fellowship, just as the face-to-face corporate worship of the congregation is the indispensable concrete realization of the local Christian fellowship. It was a temptation at Evanston to suppose that the heart of the Assembly was the study and discussion groups or the plenary sessions with their great addresses on the challenging themes of Christian life and work, to regard the worship services as a kind of extra adornment, and to suppose that the communion services, conducted according to the rites of the various constituent bodies, were a kind of curiosity. That was to miss one important meaning of the Assembly. The Assembly was intended to be and was, not incidentally but essentially, the Christian Church engaged in an act of common worship of her common Lord. Such, too, was the real meaning of the Festival of Faith at Soldiers' Field. Possibly not everyone appreciated the meaning of it. Soldiers' Field was, that night, not a theatre where people gathered as spectators to watch a drama; it was a church where Christians were gathered to worship God.

II

It would be a distortion, however, simply to consider the Assembly by itself and to omit the fact that the Assembly was, after all, an Assembly of the World Council of Churches. It is important, therefore, if we are to understand the Assembly, to see it in its relation to the Council.

It is easy, particularly because of the unusual amount of publicity which was given to the meetings in Evanston, to ignore or minimize the fact that it was in the last analysis but an episode in the continuing existence and activity of the World Council. A simple listing of these ongoing activities can scarcely do justice to them,

but it is enough to suggest their impressive scope. The three divisions (Studies, Ecumenical Action, and Inter-Church Aid and Aid to Refugees) embrace sections on Faith and Order, Evangelism, Church and Society, Missionary Studies, Youth, Cooperation of Men and Women, Work for the Laity, and the Ecumenical Institute at Bossey, together with the program of Graduate Work in the field of ecumenical study. There is a permanent Commission of the Churches on International Affairs and a close cooperation with the International Missionary Council. A Central Committee consisting of ninety representatives from the various communions and geographical areas provides a continuing leadership and coordination of activities. A Department of Information is charged with responsibility for making the program of the World Council known and understood. There is a risk that the glare of publicity, well-merited as it surely was, which shone on Evanston will blind our eyes to the fact that there is a less spectacular but no less significant continuing work.

The second Assembly, however, did something for the World Council which is not without its significance. It proved that the churches could not only get together but that, for six years at least, they could both stay together and continue to grow more closely together. The record is not an unbroken one. Since Amsterdam the Churches in China have broken off their relationship with the World Council under the pressure of the political and military conflict between East and West. Some new tensions have developed between the Orthodox churches and the Council over the issue of proselytism. This defection and this tension, however, deplorable as they are, at least serve to underscore the fact that unity of the churches is not easy nor automatic and that, when it does occur, it is a significant achievement. Those who were present both at Amsterdam and Evanston expressed their feeling that in six years the feeling of the Council's own fragility had appreciably diminished, so that the discussions at Evanston could be carried on in a more fruitful manner, unhampered as they were by fear that a candid expression of differing convictions might lead quickly to the collapse of the structure.

But these are still relatively marginal considerations. One does not confront the central issue until he faces the question of just what the World Council is; and that means, of course, the specific question of what kind of unity of the churches the Council envisions or now represents. There is no adequate term which does full justice to what the World Council really is. The term "Council" refers to a type of association. The World Council is an association of independent and sovereign churches from among those which confess that Jesus Christ is God and Saviour. Of this relationship it is at least possible to say that it is somewhere between a simple *ad hoc* relationship and an organic unity.

Beyond that, it is clear that it is of the essence of the World Council that it both expresses a unity which already exists and that it seeks to achieve a greater degree of unity than now exists. It is when we begin to analyze the term "unity" that we are likely to run into a good deal of vagueness and confusion, for the term unity has so many meanings. I think it accurate to say that the Council is a long way from knowing just what kind of

unity it would like to achieve, to say nothing of actually achieving it. It is difficult to avoid the feeling that when people talk about church unity they are frequently "talking past each other" because different people have different conceptions of what the unity involves.

The situation, however, is not so confused as the above might indicate, since a series of convictions seems to be increasingly clear. These are nowhere stated in explicit terms, but it is possible, I think, without distorting the record of Evanston, to dig them out of the statements that emerged from Evanston.

The first and elementary conviction is that the Council has no ambition to become a super-church. This is a universal conviction among the constituent bodies. Nor is it the ambition of the Council to remove all multi-formity. At the same time, it is not willing that these statements should be used as a sanction for every existing difference or disunity. Neither unity nor disunity are to be made automatic ends in themselves. It is not entirely clear what is meant by the term super-church. It should not be interpreted, I think, to mean simple organic unity. That is to say, an organically united church would not necessarily be a super-church. The Council would become a super-church so soon as and to the extent that it began to dictate to any of its constituent bodies what they ought to believe or not. The Council is firm in its conviction that, strong as is the desire for greater unity, that desire should never bring the Council to a point where it would substitute its own authority for the authority of the Word of God.

The second conviction is that the unity of Christendom is not to be undertaken as if it were to be a human achievement. A unity that is nothing more than a human achievement is not a real but an artificial unity. Unity, to be real, must be the church's unity in God. The Council becomes identified as an authentically Christian enterprise by the clarity with which it holds this conviction. In one sense, of course, there is an undeniably human element involved in the formation of the Council. It would be foolish to deny that the Council actually came into existence because certain leading individuals in the churches went to work on the problem of disunity. And if no one decided to do anything to keep the Council in existence there would simply be no Council. This human side of the unity expresses itself in the oft-repeated slogan: We intend to stay together. But this could have little meaning unless it were the reflection of a more ultimate fact, that we are already in some essential sense together. This sense, that the unity of Christendom is not to be so much an achievement as a discovery, and not a contrivance but a "gift," runs strongly through the thinking of the World Council. It is the concrete way in which it gives expression to its faith that the unity of the churches is not so much man's work as it is God's.

This could, of course, be so much empty verbiage. The difficulty of really holding on to that perspective while one is talking about church matters is great, so that there are times when people become impatient and talk as if the unification of the church is something that we must and can simply do. But in the main, the conviction that unity is not in the last analysis a human achievement had two distinct and very important effects on the general tone of the Assembly. In the first place,

there was little disposition to seek to resolve differences simply by some quick and superficial compromise. That is the natural procedure when people undertake to achieve unity. The desire for unity may become so strong that it will lead a man to deny his own inward conviction for no other reason than to make it more easily reconcilable with the conviction of another. That procedure is usable when what we call our convictions are not really convictions in the sense of being truths by which we are bound rather than opinions which "we hold." But where matters of genuine conviction are involved, such an approach to unity becomes a kind of falsification; for then we are governed not by the spirit of loyalty to truth but by the desire to be like other people. There is no real unity unless it is a unity which actually exists between men on the level of their deepest and most compelling and most truly "existential" convictions. It is toward this that the Council was pressing, rather than seeking to achieve some forced or pseudo-unity on the basis of compromise. The second important effect which this perspective had on the general temper of the Assembly is that the Assembly, properly, did not put the quest for unity in a position of first importance. In no way did the Assembly more clearly reveal its maturity than in its readiness to put another concern ahead of the concern for unity. There was a prior concern for *truth*. Indeed, the most impressive thing about Evanston was not its spirit of unity at all; more impressive even than that was the completeness of its commitment to the task of discovering and giving a relevant expression to the specifically Christian truth revealed in Jesus Christ and made known to us through the Bible. Actually, I suppose, such a quest was enriched because the churches undertook it together and provided stimulation to each other in the quest. But in a more important sense, it was seen that unity must be secondary to the concern for Christian truth. Unity can be only the by-product of the discovery of Christian truth. The delegates assembled, not first to find one another, but to put themselves where they could be found by God who is revealed in Christ. Having been found of God, they could find one another. Indeed, only by first finding God could they truly find the bond that united them to one another. It is this orientation that is the most promising feature of the whole Assembly and the World Council; for it makes of it something far more penetrating than just a sentimental effort to be very nice to everybody.

A third conviction in relation to the question of unity also manifested itself: the conviction that it was possible to say something more specific concerning the unities which actually exist between Christians of different communions. First, there is a recognition that there is one very deep sense in which all Christians are already one, not merely on the way to being one but already completely one. Ultimately, that is to say, we are united not by the fact that there is some similarity in our practices as Christians, nor by the fact that we think alike on life's issues, nor by the fact that we are seeking unity, nor even by the fact that we are agreed in recognizing that there is an objective basis for the church. This ultimate unity lies not in something subjective, but in the purely objective fact of God's work in Christ. This is the Church's ultimate basis, not merely in the historical sense that it was the work of God in Christ in history

which was the essential cause of the coming into being of the Christian church, but in the still deeper sense that the essence of Christianity is to be found not in what the Church does nor in what it thinks about Christ but what God has done in Christ. Here our unity is already perfected, by so much as God himself is one and Christ is not divided nor divisible.

But, secondly, beyond this objective unity there are also already present in greater or less degree certain "subjective" unities. Here one may say with confidence that the churches are united in *their recognition* that the essence of Christianity is that objective action of God in Christ. There is also a unity in the sense that the churches are seeking, not their own wills, but the will of God; and *this* unity is questionable only to the extent that one is ready to question the integrity of those who profess their intention to be seeking the will of God—and that means not just the will of God in the abstract, but the will of God specifically as it is disclosed in Christ and made known in the Scriptures. Up to this point we are concerned only with such subjective unities concerning which there is no doubt that they do exist to some degree in fact and that they ought to be realized more perfectly.

Beyond these two levels there is a large area of issues. Concerning these we know that we now differ. And we cannot be sure whether we ought to strive for uniformity here or whether we ought simply to let our differing conceptions co-exist and enrich one another. In short, we are not able to say now whether we would even wish for an eventual uniformity on these matters, or whether in principle the churches must be left free to express their beliefs on these matters in various ways in various

concrete circumstances. I believe I speak the mind of the Assembly when I say that at least at this juncture a strict uniformity in this area would not be desirable even if it could be achieved. For such uniformity would be well calculated to stultify the World Council and render it incapable of the creative thinking that emerges out of differing positions. So far as we can now see, at any rate, these must remain open questions. Included here is the whole area of the specific theological formulations of the precise significance of God's work in Christ; the question whether the church is to be regarded as an unblemished, holy institution or as ambiguously a divine and yet human institution in the world; the question of the form of church polity and the accompanying question of the apostolic succession; the question of open or closed communion; the question of the organic union of churches; the question of the kind of political and social order which should be identified as Christian; the question what to do in the matter of race relations; and many more.

It is highly important, as I see it, that we view the question of the unity of the churches in this light. It is the only way in which we can find meaning in the otherwise paradoxical declarations that the churches are one but must become one; or that the churches seek unity but not uniformity. To consider only the first of the levels of unity without explicit acknowledgement of the facts of our disunity is to fall victim to a wishful thinking which will be disillusioned by the realities of life. And to consider only the questions on which there is now division, without clear and explicit acknowledgement of our basic unity, is sure to prove frustrating for any who yearn for the growth of the spirit of Christian unity.

A Background for Pastoral Counseling

LARS I. GRANBERG

If we confess our sins he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness (1 John 1:9).

THE PASTOR AND PERSONAL PROBLEMS

"Dominie, I've made a perfect mess of my life!" asserts a respected middle-aged parishioner. A worried wife and mother pleads, "Please, Pastor, can't you do something? My husband's drinking is getting worse. And now my boys, they're starting to run around with such a no-good gang." A promising young man explains the mental turmoil he goes through when he must come to any sort of a decision and how he broods endlessly over a decision after he finally arrives at one. "Pastor, isn't there some way I can learn to make decisions and then quit worrying about water over the dam?" And so it goes. The pastor whose people sense that he has a genuine concern for their heartaches, disappointments and troubles soon shower him with tales of a brooding and despondent husband, a wayward son or daughter, marital difficulties, *ad infinitum*. There never has been a shortage of human problems, and the stresses and strains induced by today's unsettled times has certainly brought no lessening of them.

At the focal point of this gamut of human misery and grief sits the pastor—schooled in Greek, Hebrew, Homiletics, Church History, Theology and perhaps a course in Pastoral Care—wondering how humans manage to get involved in such complicated situations in the first place; wondering further how he can help them to extricate themselves from their difficulties without excessive damage either to themselves or to the others involved.

He is convinced that the Gospel which he preaches has the power to bring comfort to the broken-hearted and healing to the sick of mind and soul. He has seen the transforming power of Jesus Christ at work in human lives. He has seen the Word of God bring salvation, sanctification, and peace to many. But he finds the same words of admonition, exhortation or comfort which have effected such far-reaching changes in the lives of some accomplishing little or nothing in the lives of others. The thoughtful pastor probably ponders over this paradox no little.

One explanation which is often proffered rather glibly goes something like this: "What this troubled person needs is to be born again, and then he'll overcome his

alcoholism, sexual inversion, marital difficulties or chronic worrying." Now it is true that the history of the Church is replete with accounts of men who have been granted relief from deep-rooted personal problems at the time when Jesus Christ entered their lives. But there are at least two sets of data which suggest that this is at best a partial explanation. First, there is the fact that not all persons are cured of alcoholism, drug addiction, homosexuality, chronic worrying, or even a bad temper at the time of their regeneration. True, they were given new resources with which to deal with such problems, e.g., the indwelling Holy Spirit, the means of grace and the fellowship and love of their fellow believers; it nevertheless falls upon some persons to struggle for years before they finally gain ascendancy over their problem. The second observation which suggests that one can be overly glib and utterly unrealistic in linking personal problems with an unregenerate state in any simple way is that not all unregenerate persons are plagued with serious personal problems, and, conversely, many born-again believers are plagued by them.

Another over-simplified explanation often proffered, and which overcomes the objections inherent in the above explanation, is frequently stated to this effect: "If you have besetting personal problems over which you cannot gain victory, it is because you are not sufficiently yielded to the will of the Lord. If you only yield yourself, then the Lord will take this thing away." Again, we find truth in this statement. There can be little doubt that earnest resolution to submit to God's will and to grow in conformity to that will can make a difference with respect to how effectively a person deals with his problems. But would any pastor seriously contend that the absence of serious personal problems is a sure sign that a person is yielded to God's will and the influence of the Holy Spirit? Or that the devoted Christian is normally free of personal difficulties while the indifferent Christian is usually plagued by them?

The over-conscientious pastor is likely to propose a somewhat different sort of explanation. He may suggest that if he were only more fit for his holy calling, if he knew his Bible better, if his prayers were more earnest, if he set a better example for his flock—in a word, if he were only more fit for his calling, then he could present the Word in such a way that it would prove efficacious to all of his troubled parishioners.

Still another type of minister, somewhat overwhelmed by the task of drawing from his store of theological abstractions and making dextrous applications to the experience of his people, may bitterly chalk off his failures to the fact that he was never told how to deal with such matters while he was a seminary student. In this state of mind he may overlook the very real potentialities of the Christian Gospel for dealing with such matters and far too enthusiastically and uncritically embrace the claims of some psychological-nostrum peddler. He may even turn amateur psychiatrist himself.

May I suggest that the pastor who was inclined to stress regeneration as the answer was in many respects right? His mistake was to assume that all personal barriers to Christian growth were automatically removed at regeneration. Similarly, the pastor who contended that the answer lay in a deeper yielding to the will of God also was right in many respects. His mistake lay in his

assumption that all that is necessary for an individual if he wishes to align himself more fully with the will of God is that he resolve to do so. It is true that if a person is to change in a desired direction, then he must first intend to do so. And the more *wholeheartedly* he intends to do so, the greater the probability that the desired change will be effected. But it is exactly at this point, i.e., wholeheartedness, that the rub comes. It is this factor, so seldom taken properly into account, which is principally responsible for the failures alluded to above.

WHOLEHEARTEDNESS AND PERSONAL PROBLEMS

The problem of wholeheartedness (contemporary psychologists call it "integration") has plagued believer and unbeliever alike for as long as we have any record of human feelings. You will recall the Apostle Paul's lament recorded in the seventh chapter of his letter to the Romans, in which he says:

I do not understand my own actions. For I do not do what I want, but I do the very thing I hate. . . . I can will what is right, but I cannot do it. For I do not do the good I want, but the evil I do not want is what I do. . . . For I delight in the law of God, in my inmost self, but I see in my members another law at war with the law of my mind and making me captive to the law of sin which dwells in my members (7:15, 18b, 19, 22 and 23. RSV).

Here we see the great apostle expressing his distress over the fact that he can know what is right and he can resolve to do what is right; but because of factors within his personality over which he had not gained ascendancy, he was not able to do what he knew he should do and even wanted to do. This is an experience well known to each of us. And who of us accuses himself of deliberate wilfulness in the face of such an experience? We *are* resolving with all that is in us and with the help of God to do that which is right. Still something in us causes us to fail.

God's solution to double-mindedness is stated in the scripture verse with which this article began: sin is to be confessed, for the Christian can only mature spiritually as he confesses his sin and then presses forward vigorously toward his goal on the basis of the forgiveness and new understandings that have come to him as a result of proper confession, i.e., confession in which the person makes his sin as completely open before God as *his understanding permits*, accepting full responsibility for his behavior and making no efforts at self-justification.

Notice the phrase "as his understanding permits." Here we begin to see into the process which God has ordained as the method for gaining ascendancy over the troublesome aspects of our personalities. In the act of confessing without attempts at self-justification we are enabled to understand and accept our own desires and feelings and impulses more fully. This places us in a far better position to eliminate a particular hindrance. For example, not infrequently one encounters the dutiful son who is "utterly devoted" to a widowed mother. He is her source of economic support. He is her constant companion when he is not at work. Fairly often such a son is episodically bothered by "migraine" headaches or troublesome high blood pressure. One finds that his attacks (which are real enough!) frequently coincide with occasions when they disrupt some plan of his mother.

The son does not see this. He is as distressed as he can be over his mother's disappointment. Nevertheless he continues to have these attacks at moments which seem almost strategically timed to thwart his mother's cherished outing, vacation or concert.

In recent years much attention has been given to the field of psychosomatic medicine, which is concerned with bodily illnesses which ultimately either stem from or are seriously aggravated by chronic emotional tension. In the case of the son discussed above, it would be apparent that the son had been harboring certain feelings of resentment and anger over the years. Let it be made plain that his devotion to his mother is no sham. But a dependent (and perhaps demanding) mother can be both confining and frustrating. To have a life of one's own can be difficult, if not impossible, under such circumstances. To become angry at one's lot from time to time would not be unusual in such circumstances. But this young man cannot recognize and accept his true feelings. He represses any feelings of anger and resentment toward his mother. These feelings in turn cause undue stress on one or another organ system, which is climaxed by the "attacks" which seem uncannily timed to frustrate his mother's plans.

How does a person become as inwardly divided as this young man? If we can answer satisfactorily, I believe we can also answer the question why the pastor's words of admonition, exhortation or comfort are sometimes efficacious and sometimes, even though directed toward a sincere and willing person, have little or no effect. Or to state the question as the psychologist would frame it, how does harmful (neurotic) conflict get started? (The word "neurotic" implies the existence of chronic tensions brought about at least in part by factors in the personality of which the individual is unaware, i.e., unconscious wishes, motives or feelings).

The "house divided" or doubleminded state gets started in the family situation, just as does the healthy or singleminded state. Since the human infant is so utterly dependent on others for so long a period after birth, a special burden is placed on the context—particularly the emotional context—in which his needs for survival and growth are met. Our society, with its emphasis upon achievement, successful competition, and progress up the social ladder, places a particular temptation before parents that is fraught with serious consequences to the development of their children. Because it is so important to succeed, not infrequently parents tend to value their children not for what they are in themselves, but because they are potentially sources of prestige, provided they develop certain traits, skills or qualities currently cherished by society.

An example of this would be provided by a deeply religious rural community in which there is considerable status attached to having sons in the ministry. In a given family one son might be happily endowed for the ministry, a second endowed with the qualities which would lead to his becoming an able farmer or engineer. The second son might in this situation be forced through parental praise and blame to repudiate his own real desires, preferences and capacities and attempt to conform to the attitudes and capacities deemed suitable for the ministry. He would be forced to reject a substantial por-

tion of his real self and to don a pseudo-self. He might have the personal capacities and flexibility to carry this off without excessive conflict or frustration. More probably he would not be able to do so with complete success. The denied aspects of himself, which he has been forced to exclude from awareness if he is to receive the approval of his parents, can be kept out of his consciousness through a process known as "repression" (not to be confused with "suppression," which is a process where one consciously restrains and disciplines himself—a very necessary capacity if one is to mature as a person). They cannot, however, be kept inert. Neither can they be permitted entrance into awareness nor can their very existence be acknowledged, for to do so would be to threaten the individual with the loss of his parents' respect and affection and with acute feelings of unworthiness and ingratitude toward his parents for their sacrificial nurture. In the process of finding out what it meant to be good and bad, guided by his parental patterns of praise and blame, the second son had arrived at the conclusion that non-ministerially oriented portions of himself were bad; and that if he wanted to be good, he must eliminate these desires, capacities, and likes and dislikes, and take on a set commensurate with the functions of the Gospel ministry.

Here is the history of the double-minded state in brief. If these definitions of goodness and badness are indelibly worked into the child's character, so that he never arrives at a position of being able to discriminate, for example, between reasonable obedience and unwholesome submission, or between reasonable demands for orderliness and compulsive fastidiousness, his picture of what constitutes being "good" or a "credit to his parents" may well be seriously out of line with his needs as a unique individual. It may even be seriously out of line with what is important to the psychological health of any person. He is thus forced into rejecting significant portions of his personality.

These rejected desires or feelings, which are not rendered inert by repressing them, proceed to carry on a form of unconscious guerilla warfare against the conscious self. They usually break out in forms which are disguised sufficiently to render them unrecognizable to the person himself, but which are often all too plain to the observer. Examples would be the over-courteous individual who uses his polite actions to put others at a disadvantage; the "sweet, loving" individual who is always professing his love for mankind, but whose "love" was very effectively used to bully, dominate or undercut the self-respect of others; or, the "idealist" who chronically ascribes the basest of motives to the actions of others while refusing to recognize any but the loftiest aspects of his own motives. Do not suppose that these contradictions are merely the result of rational, deliberate decision. To the contrary, the aggrieved protestations of such persons when confronted with the contradictions are sincere. In order to live with themselves with some degree of comfort, they have, quite unconsciously, over the years developed elaborate defense structures which manage quite proficiently to prevent them from being confronted with these contradictions. To own these impulses and feelings as their own would be shattering, for this would prove that they were totally worthless and bad.

EFFICACIOUS CONFESSION: THE ROAD TO WHOLEHEARTEDNESS

How can this double-minded person be confronted with himself, so that he can come fully to terms with himself? How can he be induced to relinquish his pseudo-self or false-front? We have stated above that this is achieved only through confession. But how does one learn to confess properly? I believe considerable progress in Christian growth has been retarded because of a prevailing opinion that the way to confess one's sins is self-evident, so that a pastor's responsibility was largely discharged after he had cited I John 1:9 and exhorted his flock to purpose to confess faithfully. This is a specious assumption. The greater the extent to which a person is denying significant aspects of his real nature (together with any relevant aspects of external reality), the more he needs help in learning to confess.

But how is a person helped to unravel the distortions and denials which have been woven into his very life? While there is no doubt much help to be gained from devotional and pastoral literature in answering this question, the pastor is well advised not to overlook the possible contributions of the psychotherapists as well. The more I have studied the process of psychotherapy, the more I have been struck by the fact that psychotherapy can in many respects be described as a guided confessional (the "guiding" consisting of helping the individual to increasingly fully face up to and acknowledge responsibility for his own feelings and desires, not of telling him what he should confess—or "free associate," as the psychotherapist would prefer it). And psychotherapists have reaffirmed and extended what should be a truism: this process takes place best in a non-condemnatory relationship. One does not ordinarily bare his inmost thoughts and feelings before a critic. Nor does he gain in self-understanding if he must defend himself against a head-on attempt to make him admit the truth about himself. The strategy of the psychotherapist is to make the individual feel safe enough that he can drop his guard. He offers a human relationship in which a false-front is no longer necessary; wherein the individual is accepted as he is, not condemned for failing to measure up to what he should be. In such a situation the person gradually feels freer and freer to be completely honest with himself and with a fellow human being. He knows that if the person is to be helped to grow he must deal with him on the level of how he actually thinks and feels and what he really would like to do; not on the level of how the therapist thinks the person should think and feel. Praise and blame are put aside so that any thought or feeling can be fully and freely explored, for only through fully and freely bringing to the surface all of one's thoughts and feelings can one constructively come to grips with them.

This permissive, accepting attitude is the *sine qua non* of any effective personal counseling. It is of particular significance in pastoral counseling, because many persons form their impression of the forgiving qualities of God by means of the way their pastor, God's representative, reacts to their failures and shortcomings. To be accepting does not mean that one abdicate his ordination vows. One does not stop recognizing the bad consequences of certain courses of action, nor does he pre-

tend that bad actions are good actions. It does mean that one recognize that he himself is subject to the same temptations as his parishioners; and if, in the mercy of God, he has been spared either the temptation or yielding to the temptation, he recognizes this as a reason for humble thanksgiving and not as a basis of moral superiority. It further means that one learns to see the relevancy to personal counseling of the Apostle John's admonition, "There is no fear in love, but perfect love casts out fear" (I John 4:28a RSV).

SUMMARY

In any form of counseling, the counselor must always be sensitive to those factors in the counselee which prevent his responding to God and his fellow men wholeheartedly and singlemindedly. While perhaps none of us is completely integrated, this problem of unconscious factors is a far greater problem in some than in others. These unconscious factors stem from the person's feeling it necessary to deny significant aspects of himself in order to gain the approval of the significant persons in his life—typically his parents.

Denial of these aspects of self is reinforced by measures designed to exclude them from the individual's awareness. These defense measures must be set aside before the individual can come to grips with the rejected aspects of his personality and reestablish a wholehearted approach to God and his fellows. Defense measures are most readily relinquished in an atmosphere of warm friendliness and acceptance. This attitude is the *sine qua non* for successful counseling. The pastor must particularly cultivate this attitude, inasmuch as his office is already so closely identified with moral condemnation in the minds of many.

-
- Gordon Allport, *The Individual and His Religion* (New York: Macmillan, 1951).
Karen Horney, *Neurosis and Human Growth* (New York: Norton, 1950).
Erich Fromm, *Man for Himself* (New York: Rinehart, 1947).
Primarily the section on the "Marketing Orientation."
Frieda Fromm-Reichmann, *Principles of Intensive Psychotherapy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950).
Albert Outler, *Psychotherapy and the Christian Message* (New York: Harper, 1954).
David Roberts, *Psychotherapy and the Christian View of Man* (New York: Scribners, 1951).
Carl Rogers, *Client-Centered Therapy* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951).
-

WRITERS IN THIS ISSUE

D. Ivan Dykstra, '38, a member of Hope College faculty, was one of the Reformed Church's delegates at the Evanston Assembly.

Lars I. Granberg, until recently a member of Hope College faculty, is now on the teaching staff of Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, Calif.

Jan W. Falkenburg is pastor of First Church, Toronto, Canada.

Sylvio J. Scorza, '53, is a graduate student at Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey.

H. A. Kruizenga, an elder of Covenant Church, Muskegon Heights, Michigan, is the principal of the city's High School.

Paul Meyerink is a member of our senior class.

The Challenge of the Canadian Work

JAN W. FALKENBURG

INTRODUCTION

This article rests upon the conviction that it is imperative to discuss what has become known as "the Canadian work" as intensively and as often as possible. It is true, one cannot predict the development with any degree of certainty. But should we therefore refrain from trying to think about it?

Even though we have heard the voice of God requesting us "to come over and help," this should not tempt us to shut ourselves off from any questions concerning the future. We must not confuse "simple obedience" with shortsightedness, and we should not be content to sit back and watch how things, once they have started, tend to roll along almost all by themselves. It seems to me, we must not let ourselves be carried away by what is going on, but we must at least try to follow the development critically.

This article must be taken as an attempt to contribute to this critical reflection. It is not written by an "expert" on the Canadian work. I have ministered to the Dutch immigrants in Toronto, Canada, for a period of about six months. My experience, therefore, is limited. I was invited by the Editorial Board of this paper to formulate a few impressions, and I accepted this invitation hoping that in this way the discussion might get started.

I should know the Reformed Church in America a little better than any one of my Dutch colleagues in (Eastern) Canada, because I had the opportunity to spend some time at both New Brunswick and Western Seminaries. The views expressed in this paper are my personal views. They should not be taken as representing a general feeling among the workers in Canada.

A FEW OBSERVATIONS

The fact that we have come to consider the Canadian work as a missionary enterprise is a little misleading. I think it comes closer to what is called "church extension work." However, it is work not primarily among the "unchurched" but among "church-people," members of the Netherlands Reformed Church (Nederlandse Hervormde Kerk), immigrants in Canada. When the emigration to Canada started, the Netherlands Reformed Church got into contact with the United Church of Canada, trying to work out some arrangement by which the Dutch "hervormde" people would be taken care of. This arrangement, however, never worked out too well due to a lack of understanding and of material means to tackle the problem on the part of the Canadian Church.

While the United Church was supposedly busy taking care of the Dutch "hervormde" immigrants, the Reformed Church in America came to Canada, at the request of some Dutch people who had failed to find a spiritual home in one of the Canadian Churches, and could not accustom themselves to the atmosphere of the Christian Reformed Church which had started to work among the "gereformeerden" from the Netherlands quite some time earlier. Now the Netherlands Reformed Church, grateful for this initiative, decided to cooperate with the R.C.A.

This was not as matter of fact as it would seem. With Dutch people emigrating to all parts of the world, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, etc., the Church in the Netherlands had made it her policy to cooperate with the existing, native churches (in harmony with Calvin's advice!). And this was not a matter of imposing a rule upon the people, but of acting in accordance with the basic feelings of her members. But in Canada she now joined hands with a Church that was not a native Church, well-established in Canadian society, but that was a newcomer herself, and that would be made up of Dutch people only.

I think we must always bear in mind that the average "hervormde" who moves abroad is not favourably inclined towards the idea of having "his own Church." This can be illustrated I think, by the attitude of the better-educated among the Dutch immigrants in Canada. Almost without exception they turn to the Canadian Churches, the language being no barrier to them as it is to the less educated.

This observation may lead us to the question of how faithful to the R.C.A. the majority of the present members (adults, young people, children) of the Canadian congregations will remain after they have become conversant in English, have accustomed themselves to the Canadian way of life, and have become less vulnerable financially. It is hard to answer this question at this early time. And the situation varies from congregation to congregation. Nevertheless, the fact that already in some instances after a period of time this transfer of membership to a Canadian Church has taken place seems to warrant the question.

Another question is what the Reformed Church should do in dealing with those who in larger or smaller numbers finally leave her to join another Canadian Church. Should she tell such people that their move endangers their salvation? Or, should she make it clear to them that their action is a betrayal of the Reformed Church's mission in Canada?

This last question introduces the difficult matter of the relationship between the Reformed Church and the Canadian Churches (United, Presbyterian; but also Baptist, Anglican, Lutheran, etc.). The attitude of the R.C.A. is, and always has been, entirely different from that of the Christian Reformed Church, which seems to think rather disparagingly of any Church but herself, and acts accordingly.

The R.C.A. is a member of the World Council of Churches, of which organization several Canadian Churches are also members. And though this does not mean that the R.C.A. has to agree with what these Churches are and stand for, it at least seems to imply some sort of recognition as a Church of Christ. Now the question is, whether the R.C.A., when it says, in regard to the Canadian work, "we are here to stay," thinks that, notwithstanding this recognition, she cannot and should not entrust her Dutch members to the Canadian Churches, the United and the Presbyterian Churches in particular.

But this is not all. In trying to answer this question one must also take into account the (probably near) future. In this future there will be the Canadian people to deal with (after the Dutch people have been fully "canadianized"). Do we believe that the Canadian people are to receive from us something (a way of preaching, a message, or a type of church-government and church-discipline, for instance) that they do not now already receive from the existing, native Churches?

The only way to answer this question will be to know these Churches. What are their doctrinal standards, what kind of clergy is theirs, what are their seminaries like, in what way are their services conducted, what is their idea of discipline, of evangelism, of church order?

The fact, that the United and Presbyterian Churches have failed to deal adequately with the problem of immigration, certainly does not impress us favourably, but should not, I believe, be taken as sufficient proof of their being beyond hope or worthy of our complete condemnation.

It is quite well possible that some persons will reach the conclusion there can be no question of any "uniqueness" in comparison to these Churches. But even so they may feel that the presence of the Reformed Church in Canada is fully justified, now and for the time to come. They think of the (number of) Churches in a country as of an army: the more soldiers there are, the better. To them the number of Churches is nothing to worry about as long as they cooperate and do not "poach on each other's preserves." One Church lacks something that the other is able to offer. That way they perform mutually what is called "para-parochial" functions. In this line of thought there would be no need to doubt the place and the right of the Reformed Church in Canada.

I must confess that I am not yet quite convinced of the truth of this argument! Is this solution of "peaceful co-existence" the highest wisdom from an ecumenical point of view? Is this the right interpretation of Christ's words "that they may be one," or even is it the best we can do under the circumstances? Besides, it is one thing to accept a situation as it has grown historically in a country (like the U.S.A.), and yet another to help to create a situation like that in the year of our Lord 1954, in a country whose people on the one hand have proven exceptionally "union-minded" (United Church), and on the other hand have been plagued by many sects.

But there is also this. Suppose we find the Canadian Churches acceptable in so far as doctrine, church-order, etc. are concerned, but extremely weak in their practices and presenting a chaotic picture, things varying from congregation to congregation, from minister to minister. What are we supposed to do then? Should we pay no attention to this, and join them anyhow, praying to God that he might use us as the stimulus these Churches need for strengthening and purification? But who would we mean by "us"? Individuals? or one church (the Reformed Church) merging with another church (United or Presbyterian for instance)? Or should we decide that a Church in such condition can be little helped by a handful of Reformed congregations that would become lost in the so much bigger body, and therefore should continue its own work and maintain its

own organisation till the day may come that a union might be achieved?

PROSPECT OF A "MISSION"

But let us assume that we are convinced that God wants the Reformed Church to stay in Canada for at least some time. That this should happen is far from being unlikely. I for one am inclined to think that although we are in no sense unique we won't find the occasion for a union with another Canadian Church. But what will happen then? I think, we may do well to face the danger of "the elephant giving birth to a mouse," the result of a lot of money, effort, time being a handful of struggling congregations (there are about twenty organized right now), and in many ways utterly dependent upon the American main body, and forming some sort of a "Canadian appendix" to the R.C.A. This is and will be a real danger if we allow our people in Canada to get the idea that this Reformed Church is in Canada only to gather in the Dutch "hervormden."

This can only be avoided by inspiring them with the thought of having a (let us say) "mission" among the Canadian people. This may not be very difficult to achieve. I think that by far the majority of the Dutch people in Canada, who have joined the Reformed Church, in some way or other and more or less consciously feel the necessity of becoming a "Canadian Church" as soon as possible. This notion, however, must certainly be strengthened and deepened, if we don't want it to get lost in the end.

Well, if we are agreed upon becoming a Canadian Church, i.e., a Church to the Canadians, we may well realize that we are facing a fine but difficult task. I would like to confess that privately I cherish a dear hope in respect to this matter. It is that we (the Canadian and the American wing of the Reformed Church) may stay together, and that the being part of one church across the border of two countries may prove a tremendous blessing to both parts! It would mean a breaking away from the idea of the "Landes Kirche"! A little foretaste of "the coming great Church"?

We may not make it sound too revolutionary, this having one Church across the border of two nations. We know of at least one Lutheran Church being in the same position, having a Canadian and an American wing. From a practical point of view it seems to work out quite well too. Of course, it depends on how big the different parts are. The more independent of each other both are in matters of education and training of ministers for instance the better, we presume. One cannot and should not avoid the fact that the same Church has a somewhat different "face" in each country.

But let us return to the Canadian work. This Canadian work has still to grow up into the "Canadian wing" of the Reformed Church (I suppose by that time we will have to alter the name of our Church: Reformed Church in North America!). For that end it would be wonderful if two "traditions" could be united: that of the R.C.A. and that of the Neth. Ref. Church. If we could have a combination of warm communal life, faithful church-attendance, and great liberality, with thorough theological training and thinking and the fruits of new approaches to the apostolic witness in our time, our task would be glorious.

The idea of "combining" and of "uniting" may seem a little startling to those who have come to look at the Canadian work as a "missionary enterprise" of the R.C.A. But let us never forget that the Dutch "hervormde" people in Canada, though some of them are weak in the faith and others are completely "unchurched," cannot be compared with the "heathen" of India or Mexico. They bring something with them that in many instances seems well worth preserving.

The R.C.A. and the Dutch "hervormden" meet each other on what is for *both* of them foreign ground. Of course what we seek is to integrate the latter in the former, but (as I understand it) not by trying to make the Canadian congregations as "American Reformed" in every way possible. The final goal we are trying to reach in Canada cannot be to become as "Reformed" in the American way (or to remain as "hervormd" in the Dutch way, for that matter) as possible, but to train ourselves as thoroughly as possible for the job of becoming a Reformed Church for the Canadians.

It is my conviction that the simple fact that the members of the Reformed Churches in Canada become Canadians after a period of time, does not yet guarantee that therefore the conditions for being a Reformed Church for the Canadian people are fulfilled. Nor is it enough (though absolutely necessary!) to do everything we can to grow in number, establishing Churches in as many villages, towns, and cities as possible among our Dutch people living there, and in that way reach out not for a few souls here and there, but rather our goal is to reach out for the Canadian people as such. I believe that our efforts will not be justified before God unless we contribute something to the making of a truly "Canadian wing" of the Reformed Church *determinedly*, by force of will, and contribute from *both* sides, American Reformed people and Dutch "hervormden" joining hands.

Let us repeat, these contributions from both sides cannot be equal in size and importance, as is expressed already by the term, "Canadian wing of the Reformed Church." The Canadian churches will be modelled as closely as possible after the American ones. And yet, they must bear their own stamp, in which something "hervormd" will also be engraved. That this was realized and agreed upon by the Board of Domestic Missions is shown by the fact that ministers from the Netherlands were invited to take on the work among their fellow-countrymen on behalf of the R.C.A. They were re-

quired to spend some time, previous to their ministry in Canada, in the U.S.A., getting acquainted with the R.C.A. which they were about to serve. One of the happy results of the recent visit of the President and the Secretary of the Synod of the Netherlands Reformed Church to Canada is that the offer of a scholarship in the Netherlands for an American student willing to work in Canada has been made to the Board of Domestic Missions.

So far as the ministers in Canada are concerned, no one ever told them to forget or ignore what they had learnt of their Church in the Netherlands. On the contrary, it always seemed to be silently understood that, whatever knowledge and insight into matters of importance they had acquired while at home, they would make to bear on their task and calling.

CONCLUSION

I do hope that the R.C.A. will continue to assist in creating a truly "Canadian wing." Fortunately there are signs that the Netherlands Reformed Church is beginning to face up to the issue also. While this is taking place I would like to appeal to all churches and ministers of the R.C.A. to follow the course of events in Canada as closely as possible. "Personal interest" stories of poor Dutch immigrants having many problems and difficulties tell only a part of the story. We in Canada need something more than sympathy or even money. We need thinking with us, and sharing with us in the attempts to solve the problems we are facing. Let us be insistent that we keep up a mutual interest in each other's business. And let us be frank! More marriages have failed because of suppressed facts and concealed criticisms than of frank confessions and open discussions.

The time will come that the churches in Canada will form their own classes, but for a while they will still be members of American classes. This is a wonderful opportunity to show a profound interest in each other and to establish many unbreakable ties. We must get to know each other, understand each other, love each other intimately.

And let us not have to be afraid to speak our minds. If God wants us to build a Church, then that is what we ought to be concerned with, that is what matters. Our ideals can wait. Let's take seriously what is really important, what has a bearing on the cause, but let's take that *seriously!*

Seminary Highlights

The Seminary Convocation Conference was held at Camp Geneva, September 7-10. Because of the World Council of Churches Assembly at Evanston, three outstanding speakers appeared before the assembled students, ministers, and their wives. Dr. Marcel Pradervand, Executive Secretary of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches, Geneva, Switzerland, addressed the conference on the task of the Reformed Churches in the world. Dr. Harmannus Obendiek, a pastor of various Reformed Churches in Germany and now Professor of Practical Theology at the Kirchliche Hochschule, Wuppertal, spoke concerning the ministry of the Reformed Church. The third speaker, who is

well-known for his courageous Christian stand against Nazism, was Dr. Martin Niemoeller. His lectures emphasized the crisis and the challenge the Church faces today. A ladies' assembly (to which the men were invited and many attended) was addressed by Mrs. Niemoeller in which she told of her experiences among the churches behind the iron curtain. Friday morning the Seminary Convocation convened at the Third Reformed Church with President John R. Mulder presiding, and Dr. Niemoeller bringing the message entitled "The Christian Message in a World of Fear." A seminar on the World Council of Churches Assembly at Evanston was conducted by Dr. Elton

Eenigenburg, Professor of Historical Theology, and Dr. D. Ivan Dykstra, Professor of Philosophy, Hope College. These men were the official representatives of the Reformed Church in America to the Evanston Assembly. All sessions of the conference were well-attended, especially those featuring Dr. Nie-moeller.

Most of the students arrived from their summer fields of service in time to attend the convocation conference. The returning members of the senior class and their fields of service follow: Paul Alderink, Bethesda and Eagle Creek (Presbyterian), Ohio; Robert Bos, Hope, Chicago, Illinois; Donald Brandt, Bethany, Grand Rapids, Michigan; William Carlough, Pulpit Supply; Harold Cupery, Eddyville, Iowa; Gordon De Pree, Homewood, Illinois; Donald De Young, East Harlem, New York City; Herman Dragt, Sterling, Illinois; Darrell Franken, Keystone, Indianapolis, Indiana; Howard Hanko, Annville, Kentucky; Donald Hoffman, Calvary (Texas Corners) Kalamazoo, Michigan; Robert Henningses, Rhinebeck, New York; Cornie Keunen, Fond du Lac, Wisconsin; Harold Korver, Dell Rapids, South Dakota; Earl Kragt, East Fruitport, Michigan; Paul Meyerink, Christian Park, Indianapolis, Indiana; Albert Moss, Monarch, Alberta, Canada; John Nyitray, Normandale, Pekin, Illinois; James Parsons, Synod of Ohio, Presbyterian; John Tien, Emmanuel, Chicago, Illinois; Wayne Tripp, Pulpit Supply (East); Paul Vander Woude, Lynden, Washington; Cornelius Van Heest, Grace, Grand Rapids, Michigan; Kenneth Van Wyk, Barnard, Charlevoix, Michigan; Melvin Voss, Pleasant Prairie Classis; David Wilson, Waterloo, Iowa; Garret Wilterdink, Pulpit Supply; Charles Wissink, Pulpit Supply; Thomas Zylstra, Matlock, Iowa.

The following are the members of the middle class: Kenneth Berends, Pulpit Supply; Russell Block, Wyandotte, Michigan; Robert Conner, Remembrance Chapel, Grand Rapids, Michigan; David De Vries, Lutheran Camp, Chicago, Illinois; David Hager, Yellowstone Park, summer preacher; Mark Hesselink, Grand Rapids Classis; William Hoffman, Kunkle (Presbyterian), Ohio; Roy Kats, Antelope Valley, South Dakota; Louis Kraay, Dulce, New Mexico; Neal Mol, North Park, Kalamazoo, Michigan; Sylvester Moths, Gibson, Michigan (6 weeks); George Muyskens, Denver, Colorado; Joseph Muyskens, Pulpit Supply in Iowa; Robert Ondra, Pulpit Supply; Robert Otto, Gibson, Michigan (6 weeks); Burrell Pennings, Glen Lake, Michigan; Carl Schroeder, Cleveland, Ohio; Robert Spencer, Nardin Park, Detroit, Michigan; Carl Van Farowe, East Harlem, New York City; Douglas Van Gessel, Pulpit Supply, California; Edward Viening, Camp Geneva, Holland, Michigan; Collins Weeber, Pulpit Supply; Arvin Wester, Monroe, South Dakota.

Three members of the student body have transferred to other seminaries: Lynn Joosten and Isaac Rottenberg to New Brunswick Theological Seminary and Stuart Noordyk to Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, California. On the other hand, four men have come to us from other schools: Paul De Vries, Grand Rapids, Michigan, from Calvin Seminary and William Nelson, Corbin, Kentucky, from Bob Jones University Graduate School of Religion, have entered the middle class. Richard Parramore, Chester, Pennsylvania, from the Reformed Episcopal Seminary, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, has joined the senior class. Robert Zap, Chicago, Illinois, from Northern Baptist Seminary has entered the junior class, which is the largest class to enter Western Seminary. These new men are: Levi Akker, Fulton,

Illinois; Jack Boerigter, Holland, Michigan; Gerrit Boogerd, Hull, Iowa; Richard Bouwkamp, Grant, Michigan; Julius Brandt, Holland, Michigan; James Brinkhuis, Rock Valley, Iowa; John Busman, Coopersville, Michigan; David Cornell, South Haven, Michigan; Arthur De Fouw, Holland, Michigan; Eugene De Hoogh, Monroe, South Dakota; Raymond De Vries, Chicago, Illinois; Robert Dykstra, Midland Park, New Jersey; Richard Evers, Chicago, Illinois; Orville Haan, Grand Haven, Michigan; Roderic Jackson, Kent City, Michigan; Donald Jansma, Morrison, Illinois; Charles Johnson, Detroit, Michigan; Wesley Kiel, Lynden, Washington; Earl Laman, Holland, Michigan; Edwin Martin, Midland Park, New Jersey; James Meeuwssen, Grand Rapids, Michigan (Second Quarter); Norman Menning, Hospers, Iowa; Harold Opperman, Holland, Michigan; Richard Pruiksmas, Clifton, New Jersey; Norman Ratering, Holland, Michigan; Thurman Rynbrandt, Holland, Michigan; Robert Smith, Kalamazoo, Michigan; Thomas Thomasma, Grandville, Michigan; Raymond Teusink, Holland, Michigan; Charles Vander Beek, Oskaloosa, Iowa; Cornelius Vander Heyden, Homewood, Illinois; James Van Hoeven, Grand Rapids, Michigan; Larry Veenstra, Muskegon, Michigan; Kenneth Vermeer, Sioux Center, Iowa; Gilbert Visser, Oskaloosa, Iowa; Nevin Webster, Dearborn, Michigan.

There is seldom a year that there are no foreign students in attendance, and this year is no exception. Pyung Doo Kang, Pusan, Korea, is here for his second year, and Paul Shih has come from the Ebenezer Bible Institute, Zamboanga City, Philippine Islands, to begin his seminary work.

There are also several special students attending various class sessions: Henry Alexander, Ganges, Michigan, Donald Cozadd, Akron, Michigan, and Robert Cobb, Saginaw, Michigan.

The five Dutch students, Gerrit Molenaar, Cornelius G. Bons, John A. Heldring, Hendrik J. Boekhoven, and Jan W. Falkenburg, have all taken up their work in Canada. Paul Diez, the Foreign Exchange Student from Germany, after hitch-hiking nearly 15,000 miles through the United States, has returned to his homeland.

During the continued absence of Professor W. Goulouze, the Board of Trustees has engaged Dr. Marion de Velder, pastor of Hope Church, and the Rev. Abraham Rynbrandt, pastor of Maplewood Church, both of this city, to teach the courses in pastoral theology.

The Adelpia Society is beginning this year with a course in Calvin's *Institutes* taught by Dr. Raymond Van Heukelom, pastor of the First Church, Holland.

The annual seminary reception for the students and their wives or lady friends was held Friday, October 1, at 8 p.m. at the Third Church. The evening featured Mr. Glenn Stewart, Kalamazoo, Michigan, who gave a reading based on the Joseph narrative, and special music was furnished by James Neevel, a junior at Hope College and the grandson of the late Dr. S. C. Nettinga, one time president of Western Seminary. Professor and Mrs. Richard C. Oudersluis and Professor and Mrs. Elton Eenigenburg composed the committee in charge.

The construction of the new seminary plant continues rather well on schedule. Even though the steel has been a little slow in arriving, it is expected that the roof will be completed before inclement weather sets in. This will enable the carpenters to carry on the interior work during the winter. An effort will be made to make two or three classrooms available for use as soon as possible.

Book Reviews

An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek, by C. F. D. Moule, Cambridge: University Press, 1953. Pp. x-241. \$5.00.

Professor Moule intends this book on New Testament Greek syntax for the use of students who are already familiar with the language. It is to be a companion in exegesis. In this limited capacity the book will prove useful. It is not an exhaustive study. The reader will rather find selective detailed material under each of the main headings of syntax. This is modestly called by the author, "an obviously incomplete idiom book—an amateur's collection of specimens." He was assisted and encouraged in his work by the late Professor J. M. Creed and Dr. C. H. Dodd, and is carrying on in the scholarly footsteps of his father, H. W. Moule. He appears to be well-versed in the standard works of Robertson, Burton, and Moulton.

The book is equipped with valuable indices. In the index of passages are references to about two thousand verses or passages in the New Testament, in addition to others in the Old Testament and secular writers. The numerous quotations from the New Testament bejewel the text; in sprightly and colorful English Professor Moule translates some of these. The index of Greek words and the index of persons and subjects are of briefer compass.

There are few hard and fast rules given by the author, and many constructions under consideration are left with a question mark. In fact the exceptions to the rules are granted a place of prominence. Occasionally undue preference is given to an unusual interpretation over against the straightforward one. In these cases the author tends to back down to a parenthetical question.

Professor Moule has a fondness for comparing New Testament Greek syntax with Latin syntax. He traces, for instance, the distribution of the Latin ablative usages through the various Greek cases. He also has a short chapter on "Latinisms."

The first chapter in the book deals briefly with the language of the New Testament has *koine*. A word of caution is inserted: "the pendulum has swung rather too far in the direction of equating biblical with 'secular' Greek; and we must not allow these fascinating discoveries to blind us to the fact that biblical Greek still does retain certain peculiarities (which must be far stronger in the New Testament than in an equivalent bulk of colloquial or literary 'secular' Greek, even allowing for the permeation of society by Jewish settlements), and in part to the moulding influence of the Christian experience, which did in some measure create an idiom and a vocabulary of its own."

Aktionsart plays an important role in the determination of Greek tenses, but the author points out that it is not a universal role. He lists verses in which the "linear" and "punctiliar" tenses are used in an inexplicable manner. In a later chapter, p. 136, he gives his working rules: "i. Where there could be any ambiguity, writers tended (more or less according to their degree of accuracy and feeling for style) to distinguish between the Present and Aorist *Aktionsart*. ii. Where there could be no ambiguity, the tense was determined by sheer chance, or euphony, or tradition, or availability of words. iii. The student will be well advised to observe the *Aktionsart* rules as precisely as possible when he is translating English into Greek, and to take special care, when translating Greek into English, to see what the writers themselves do." He also counteracts

the tendency to call all combinations of the forms of the verb "to be" with participles periphrastic constructions. He cites Luke 2:8: "there were (i.e. existed) shepherds, staying in the fields." He restricts in addition the occurrences of so-called "impersonal verbs."

The optative mood is fading out in *koine* Greek. Moule explains this on the basis of its overlapping with the subjunctive. The optative, being weaker, receded into the background.

The ambiguity in many New Testament passages lies in some tenses between the middle and passive voices. The author treats briefly several such examples, not, however, arriving at a decision in most of the examples treated.

Moule discusses the noun in terms of five cases. He recognizes traces of the ablative and the locative in certain abverbs. The functions of the ablative, locative and instrumental cases are not considered separately from those of the genitive and dative. With regard to the last two, he makes much of the use of the genitive as the direct object of certain verbs, but lightly passes over the dative in similar usage.

The longest chapter of the book by far is that on prepositions. They are viewed as very important, yet the author recognizes a certain amount of fluidity in N.T. prepositions as over against those in classical Greek. He classifies the proper prepositions in the usual way, by the number of cases they govern. The improper prepositions are given alphabetically, with notes on the important ones. The chapter closes with an excellent discussion of prepositions compounded with verbs. Moule finds the distinction between prepositions and adverbs to be quite tenuous.

A rather basic matter is omitted in the chapter on "The Adjective." There is no mention of the attributive and predicate positions. This does not appear in the chapter on "The Order of Words" either.

With reference to the article, Professor Moule makes use of Apollonius' canon and Colwell's rule as to its use and non-use. He does not appear to know Sharp's rule, but he comes to the same interpretation of Titus 2:13 and II Peter 1:1 without it. In these verses it is acknowledged that Jesus Christ is God and Savior.

In his chapter on the infinitive, the author covers the more peculiar uses. The regular uses are discussed under the various types of clauses. He discovers that *hina* and *hote* overlap in use in final and consecutive clauses. The chapter on *hoti* is very short.

An interesting chapter is the one on "Semitisms." There is a general survey of the style and a list of Semitic idioms in particular. Moule gives a bibliography of 30 books and articles on the subject at the end of the chapter.

While it cannot be called outstanding, this book can find its place as a satisfactory tool on the New Testament student's shelf.

—SYLVIO J. SCORZA.

Fundamentals in Christian Education, edited by C. Jaarsma, Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1953. Pp. 482. \$5.00.

This book is not a treatment of the subject of Christian education by a single author, but rather, a collection of addresses and papers, most of which were delivered before the National Union of Christian Schools conventions at various times during the last quarter of a century. The authors of these papers are leaders of the Christian Reformed Church in Amer-

ica and its counterpart in the Netherlands. They include many leaders from Calvin College and Calvin Seminary. The authors from the Netherlands are all serving in some administrative capacity in its parochial schools. Mr. Jaarsma outlines for you the high points of each chapter and adds certain comments of his own to supplement or explain what the author is trying to say.

It is the purpose of the book to help the church take stock of its schools. The author does not profess to have the final word on Christian education but offers this book to the church and the teachers in the Christian Schools as "food for thought" and "to make available some fundamental discussions on Christian education." What constitutes a Christian school? He feels that "when we stop to examine critically what we have done, we are embarrassed to find how vague our notion of Christian teaching and learning still is" (p. 7).

The book is divided into four sections: I. The basis for Christian education; II. The aim of Christian education; III. Organization and implementation of the program of Christian education; IV. Conclusion. (It is my understanding that the phrases "Christian education" and "Christian schools" as used in the book and as referred to in this review pertain only to parochial education and parochial schools and even more specifically to parochial education, etc., as interpreted by the leaders of the Christian Reformed Church. It does not follow that this is my personal interpretation.)

The first basis for Christian education springs from the doctrine of the covenant. I quote from Mr. Jaarsma's comments. "The Christian school follows from the covenant promises to and covenant obligations of Christian parents. This scriptural principle controls the entire Christian school idea. Everything we say about schooling or education in the school follows from this principle. Only the Christian school can relate this principle to the facts of education. Sometimes we hear other grounds given to justify the Christian school. While many of these grounds have merit as a reason for establishing and maintaining schools founded on the Bible, they generally do not point primarily to the covenant obligation of parents. Hence, they are at best secondary considerations. In a sense they follow from the covenant idea" (pp. 37-38).

The argument for Christian schools evolves from the doctrine of the covenant somewhat as follows. "In the *first* place this necessity is involved in the fact that the children of Christian parents are . . . adopted into the family of God. Can we at all doubt whether this calls for Christian education? (p. 31). The necessity of Christian education follows, in the *second* place, also from the fact that the children of Christian parents fall heir to the covenant promises . . . These bounties naturally call for gratitude . . . But how can they be adequately thankful unless they are taught to see how much they have received? (pp. 32-33). In the *third* place it follows from the requirements of the covenant. God requires of covenant children that they believe in Jesus Christ unto salvation and that they turn from sin to holiness . . . It is a very comprehensive requirement . . . Hence the need of Christian education" (p. 34, Berkhof).

In the form of baptism, the third question exacts from parents the promise that they will be faithful in teaching their children the glorious saving truth. Since in modern civilization the parent is compelled to send his child to school for such a large portion of the day, it necessarily follows that the parent is unable of himself to carry out the baptismal vows adequately and so he sets up schools to act *in loco parentis*. These schools then must teach the faith as we understand it. Hence it follows that the public schools are not for covenant children. Furthermore, education is a unitary process. Therefore, the home, the

church and the school must agree on the fundamentals of teaching. "Can Christian parents reasonably expect their children to be imbued with the spirit of true religion if they persist in sending them to a school where for twenty-four hours a week they are taught in a spirit that is fundamentally irreligious, if not positively anti-Christian?" (p. 82-83, Berkhof). This is a gross overstatement.

A little later in the book, Mr. Schultze says, "I know of no higher objective than that of developing integrated personalities" (p. 182). But he goes on to say, "Even within the school it is possible that the various teachers having the same child [may] be promoting disintegration in the child's life" (p. 183). Mr. Ryskamp states, "I am convinced that in many cases, he [the student] gets by far the greater part of his education not in the school room, but on the street, on the playground, at the swimming-hole, at home, and where not" (p. 185). This leads me to suggest that if a child is to have an integrated personality, that integration must go on within himself. This is implemented by a spirit which has been carefully nurtured and developed at his mother's knee. He cannot escape receiving many conflicting thoughts, ideas, principles, etc., but he sails a safe course through troubled waters, guided by the Holy Spirit which dwells within him.

In this connection, I think of the child Moses, who was raised at his mother's knee but was educated in all the schools of the Egyptians. His mother had no need to fear the knowledge which he gained in the pagan schools as long as each night he would return to her side to be tucked into bed by her hands and there to be taught the prayers which she would teach him. There was nothing unusual in the fact that in later years he would "refuse to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter, choosing rather to share ill-treatment with the people of God than to enjoy the fleeting pleasures of sin."

According to Mr. Jellema, the Calvinistic world and life view makes Christian schools prerequisite. I quote, "The pivotal difference is not that we believe education should also include training in religion; the home and the church might provide that element. Nor is it that we believe the school must supplant the home or the church or both; we accept a division of labor between the three. Nor is it that we believe theology the only science our children should learn; . . . [we emphasize] our catholic acceptance of all the sciences . . . [It] lies particularly in the Calvinist's characteristic . . . insistence that God is not only the object in the narrower sense of religious faith and devotion but is also the ground and end of all existence and truth and value; or . . . that religious faith is confirmed by and itself furnishes the ultimate explanation of and motivation for all human experience and activity; in short, that religion and reason and morality are inextricably interwoven" (p. 71).

This too, I believe, the great majority of Christians around the world would agree to. Perhaps my personal experience would be of interest. Except for my four years at Hope College, all of my education was received in the public schools. After spending three years teaching in a mission school, I have spent close to twenty years as a teacher and administrator in the public schools. All of my experience in public school education has done nothing to impair my Calvinistic faith but it has done much to broaden it.

I certainly cannot accept the viewpoint of Mr. Berkhof when he says, " . . . a person who is really Reformed, i.e., who makes the will of God the law of his life, and who is guided in all the relations which he assumes and in all the activities in which he participates by Reformed principles, cannot pos-

sibly assume an attitude of hostility to the Christian school without compromising his religious convictions" (p. 83). Although I question whether the position of the average Protestant would be hostile to parochial schools, it would certainly be opposed to them. Perhaps I can state the average Protestant view. He believes in education for all children and youth without exception. How best can this be provided? Private individuals or corporations would scarcely meet our farflung educational needs. If we depended upon church institutions to educate the rising generation within a population of a hundred fifty million people, the most likely result would be chaos. The only reasonable alternative is the public school system supported by *all the people* and administered by representatives of *all the people*. Anything that stands to weaken this latter system is to be eyed with grave misgiving. Throughout this book, it is made perfectly clear that Christian schools are for covenant youth only. If carried to its logical conclusion, each church or sect would set up its own school. Only the child outside the organized church would be sent to the public school. No Christian would assume an obligation to the boy or girl outside the organized church. In contrast to this, I believe in public education where the Christian takes his position of leadership in the classroom, comforted by the prayer of Jesus when he said, "I do not pray that thou shouldst take them *out of the world*, but that thou shouldst keep them from the evil one."

I am alarmed at the attitude taken by certain writers in this book. Let me quote from Mr. Van Til, "We cannot believe in our program and we do not believe in our program if we look at it merely as something that is somewhat better than the program of our enemies . . . Our hope for the future lies in the conviction that our enemies *will be destroyed*" (p. 137). Has he set the program of the Christian Reformed Church on a pedestal beyond the reproach of man? Is the school as set up by the Christian Reformed Church the *sine qua non* of all education? Must the concept of Christianity as believed by other Christians fade into oblivion before the concept which is being set forth by Mr. Van Til? This is a sample of the intolerance which has hindered Christianity in ages past. This kind of intolerance would be fostered by a program of Christian schools.

According to Mr. Ryskamp, "Real education . . . ought to mean social development . . . [the social purpose] is real unity and harmony of the individual with his fellows, harmony of the individual with all the universe" (p. 86). It means education of individuals in the very midst of society in order that they may function together naturally, harmoniously, etc. We would concur with Mr. Ryskamp in this. But is a child being educated in the very *midst of society* when educated in the Christian school? To me he has cited a very potent argument against the Christian school.

Mr. Heerema spends some time developing the idea of the "mass-man" in society today. He says, "It is my considered opinion that the type of political and social movement that has dominated the American scene for these past twenty or more years is also basically a movement of the common man as we have described him. With persistent pre-occupation with physical things the mass-man in our land has demonstrated his essential character by seeking advantages continually and not wishing to accept the accompanying responsibilities" (p. 197). "Today we have to consider a tremendous mass of human energy driving onward relentlessly without the controls that are formulated by standards of truth and right and cultural worth" (p. 199). In the light of this, Christian education becomes our urgent mission. Now if this condition exists in our society,

has Mr. Heerema reached the correct conclusion when he says that Christian education is the answer? You understand that Christian education still refers to parochial education. It is my opinion that this so-called mass-man is not to be found within the Christian church. If this is true, he will never be changed by Christian education. The answer must lie in and through public school education.

The third section of the book deals largely with curriculum problems, authority in the school, teaching techniques, etc. A good share of this section is written by educators from the Netherlands. Personally, I think that they have an old world view of education which cannot easily be transplanted into our democratic society. In general, I am sure that all Christian school teachers, whether in the parochial school or in the public school, will carry out their task in the light of Christian psychology. I do not believe that the problems discussed vitally affect the Christian church.

In conclusion, I feel that this book gives a statement of the Reformed faith which most of us would accept wholeheartedly. However, at the same time, a great portion of the members of the Reformed Church would disagree with the conclusion that the answer to the educational problems within the United States is to be found in the establishment of the Christian School. Somewhere in the book, it is suggested that each member of the church should tithe, giving one-third to the church, one-third to the Christian school, and one-third to outside charities. It is my feeling that, by this formula, funds that should go to the extension of the kingdom of God on earth, are being channeled into the cause of Christian schools. And through the Christian schools, the cause of the Christian Reformed Church is being effectively promoted. But the cause of the kingdom of God on earth is greater by far than mere denominationalism.

---- — H. A. KRUIZENGA.

Against the Stream, by Karl Barth, edited by Ronald Gregor Smith, London: SCM Press Ltd., 1954. Pp. 252. 16 s.

This little volume is a collection of occasional post-war writings by Karl Barth, certainly the most influential and possibly the most controversial single figure in twentieth century Protestantism. For the most part these writings deal with the Christian faith in its recent and contemporary encounter with varying political realities on the European continent. By a considerable stretching of the term, these could be regarded as providing, though in quite unsystematic fashion, significant materials for a Christian doctrine of the State. It goes without saying that they are not at all merely academic treatises. Christians in general and Barth in particular have been living sufficiently close to the political upheavals of the past two decades to assure that these materials are not abstract theory.

Many Christians in the West have been disturbed by the manner in which Barth and other European leaders whom he has influenced have apparently come close to making their peace with the Communist order. For them it is of the highest importance to study these documents as an aid to understanding the situation. That is not to say that the book is devoted to the Communist issue; it is not. But it is an important disclosure of what European Christians are saying and can say to other European Christians in our time, including those behind the Iron Curtain. Those who might have expected that these were taking their texts from the Communist Manifesto will be encouraged by the knowledge that at least this Christian could talk very specifically as a Christian. It is just a straw

in the wind, to be sure, but helpful even so at a time when we are so dependent on small bits of evidence in order that we may get a picture of the situation of Christianity in the Iron Curtain countries.

To the extent that these writings are an adequate criterion, Christian thought in the midst of Europe's tensions has succeeded in avoiding the pitfalls of an innocuous quietism on the one hand and a subtle secularizing (or "politicizing") of the Christian faith. There is, according to Barth, to be no prescribed attitude which Christians must take toward this or that particular political pattern; but he goes further than I suppose many western activists would have expected him to, in his recognition of the State as an expression of the divine providence. The State, to be sure, is not and cannot be the Church or replace it; and the Church must in all circumstances be the Church and neither become nor take its orders from the State or base its message on political considerations. But the State is recognized, certainly not as an evil thing which must be destroyed; on the contrary, it is the instrument of God's gracious government of the world, at least in the sense that it is an expression of the divine patience in restraining the world's chaos and giving man time for preaching, for repentance, and for faith. At this point, Barth might appear to come perilously close to seeing the State as the servant of the Church, but he is quick to protect his position from abuse by recognizing that the State does not and cannot by its nature do the work of the Church, and that where the State does serve the purposes of the Church it is not the Church conceived as a power movement but as the preaching institution. So far as I have been able to discover, there is no mention in these writings of the common Anglo-Saxon Christian concept of the State as a divine agency for the achievement of human welfare in the sense of the alleviation of wants.

It is distressing to have to select so few items for specific mention and to omit all reference in this review to many other significant matters. But at least one other very large significance of these writings must be underscored. The writings will be stimulating to American readers because of the difference between Barth's and the ordinary American Christian approach to the political question. One difference is that Barth insists that there is no specifically Christian doctrine of the ideal state, and no identification of any such an ideal State in the past or in the future as the object of Christian striving. American Christians have never been able to think of this problem except in terms of an ideal toward which Christian people should strive. The relation of the Church and State, according to Barth, is specifically not this, that the Church should provide a blueprint to which the State must be brought into conformity. The relation is rather that of individual Christians making their decisions concerning their attitude toward any particular State in any particular time, not in terms of how well or how poorly it conforms to some ideal pattern, but rather by drawing inferences from the content of an evangelical Christianity.

And this points to a further important difference between the political thinking of American Christians and that represented here. Oversimplification at this point is dangerous but the main lines of that difference can be quickly suggested. I think it accurate to say that in the main, American Christians have been content to see political implications in only one or a very few points of the Biblical witness—say, in the Sermon on the Mount, or, better still, in Jesus' own ministry of concern during his life on earth. Here and there, more recently, there has been an awareness that there is significance even for political life, in the deeper "theological" aspects of Christianity, such as the Incarnation.

In contrast to this, the tendency evident in Barth is to see the political implications in a much wider range of Christian conceptions, which includes the Incarnation, Justification, Salvation, Election, the Body of Christ, the Christian Communion, the Diversity of Gifts, etc., etc. The significance of this direction should not be overlooked, for, if it can be maintained, it will go far toward quieting the uneasiness often felt by us who see the significance of Christianity not in some selected feature of Christianity which happens to strike our fancy but rather in the whole range of its truth as expressed in the Church's theology. Our efforts to think specifically as Christians in political and social matters have had to be undertaken with a sense of disquiet; for as we have moved into these areas, we have, in the West, had to leave behind our most important evangelical concepts on the ground that these possess no political or social relevance. We have had to feel that the social and political message of the churches has its point of contact with the Christian faith only at one point, and that one possibly not the most fundamental point of Christian belief. That feeling could be overcome if the direction in which Barth moves could be maintained. In fact, this approach could open an entirely new chapter in the political and social thinking of the evangelical churches, who have always been moved by the sentiment of social concern but who have wished that they could move into this area not merely on the wings of a noble sentiment, fine as that is, but as specific Christians speaking, not from the periphery of the Christian faith, but from its solid center.

It would be foolish to urge, as our philobarthians will surely do, that now that Barth has had his say, all questions are settled. It would be foolish even to urge that the thing he tries to do can really be done. The big question which is left to be studied is whether it is possible to move from such core Christian concepts as were indicated above to specific decisions in the area of politics, ethics, and society. The problem is pointed up by the fact that in speaking of the decisions made by the Christians in the light of his faith, the Christian makes his decision on the basis of the "analogy" between his faith and the political situation. Some of the analogies which Barth draws are not entirely convincing. Such analogical thinking may be all that the Christians can do, but it must be remembered that the relation of analogy is not clearly an existential one; it may be nothing more than a similarity in some appearances. Thus one has to raise the question whether, on Barth's grounds, there is after all a very real connection between the Christian's faith and the arena of his political decision.

There is a great deal more in this collection of writings than this. But reference even to this much of what it contains should be enough to caution us against supposing that this is just another series of purely casual writings. It raises issues which are full of revolutionary potential for the Christian faith in our time.

—D. IVAN DYKSTRA.

The Second Coming of Christ, by Louis Berkhof, Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co. 1953. Pp. 102. \$1.50.

No other subject is so current as the Second Coming of our Lord. If our thoughts have not been turned to it by dispensationalist and fundamentalist emphasis, the Evanston meeting of the World Council of Churches must have aroused us. Here is a small book that aims to present the truth concerning "this glorious appearance of the Lord at the end of the ages" (p. 5) in a manner appealing to people in general, for, writes Dr. Berkhof, it is "a very important scriptural truth which does not

POSTMASTER—If undeliverable as addressed, for any reason, please notify sender, stating reason and giving new address if known, on Form 3547, postage for which is guaranteed.

always receive due attention in the preaching of the Word of God" (p. 6). The author deals with five facets of the Second Coming: its time, manner, purpose, glory and comfort. His treatment is first, scriptural by which he presents his view, the conservative a-millennial position. Often he introduces historical aspects of the various facets, and he always attempts to set forth the modernist position and the complex premillennial view. Such a book is welcome because it comes in a clear yet scholarly style from the mind of a theologian known for his conservative, Calvinistic position.

Dr. Berkhof introduces his work from an historical perspective. The Church through recent decades and centuries has been more concerned with the first coming of Christ. While the early Church looked forward to her wedding day as the bride of Christ, the Church of our day has often been too concerned with her engagement, i.e., Christ's first appearance. However, the Church has been reminded frequently of the Second Coming by some reactionary groups or by the emphasis upon a desire for deliverance in times of distress. Date-setting is now regarded as futile calculation, and it is realized that whenever Christ does return it will be in bodily form but the time is unknown and the Biblical statement of attendant circumstances leaves questions to be asked.

Pertaining to the time of Christ's appearance the Bible exhorts us to watchfulness because it is often written "I come quickly" (Rev. 3:11 et al.). On the other hand there is an understanding that it will not be immediately (II Thess. 2). This may seem to be a paradox but we should remember how God looks at time (Ps. 90:4; Is. 28:16). Again, it is to be remembered that some of Christ's references to his coming are not always speaking of a physical appearance (cf. Mt. 16:28; Jn. 14:3).

Dispensationalists consider that the Second Coming is the next thing on the prophetic calendar, but, asks Dr. Berkhof, what about certain events which are not yet history? Dr. Berkhof explains that their answer lies in the two-fold view of the Second Coming—the rapture and the day of the Lord—which may be scripturally contested.

Regarding the manner of Christ's second coming, Dr. Berkhof claims on the basis of Scripture that it will be personal, physical, visible, and sudden. Modernists who deny most or all supernatural beliefs can not accept this description. This follows from a denial of Christ's bodily resurrection and ascension. It is also shown that some dispensationalists and the Jehovah's Witnesses deny the visibility of the return.

The purpose of Christ's Second Coming is to complete the work of redemption. His sacrificial work is complete, his intercessory work is going on, but his return will see the concomitant events of the general resurrection and the final judgment. By means of the resurrection all mankind shall stand before the judgment throne of God where the wheat shall be separated from the tares. This is, of course, denied by the modernists who deny all physical supernatural resurrection. The dispensationalists divide and complicate the last events in a

questionable way which seems scripturally unsound.

The glory of Christ's Second Coming consists of the glory of his person, his supernatural appearance on the clouds of heaven, the glorification of the Church, the victory over his enemies, the great celebration of the victory in heaven, and the regeneration of the universe.

The last chapter on the comfort of Christ's Second Coming is built around the statements of the Belgic Confession, Article XXXVII and the Heidelberg Catechism, Question 52. These are the specific comforts of Christ's coming to judge the quick and the dead: the blessed assurance that Christ will continue his redemptive work, the promised and absolute certainty of his Second Coming which means that present conditions will not last forever, and a complete revelation of the love and mercy of God, thus clarifying God's mysterious dealings with people and other present perplexities. It is in this chapter that Dr. Berkhof seems to become bitter against the dispensationalist. He tends to magnify the possibility of either side comforting themselves with "a bunch of lies" by recounting a post-lecture encounter with a dispensationalist. Perhaps this is his way of increasing popular appeal, but it decreases the serious reasonableness of the foregoing chapters.

This book is worthy of close attention by laymen and ministers who, as Dr. Berkhof intimates, have failed to give due attention to last things in their preaching of the Word of God.

PAUL MEYERINK.

ADDITIONAL NEWS ITEMS

We were privileged to have another of the World Council Assembly delegates on our campus in the person of the Rev. J. E. Lesslie Newbigin, Bishop in Madura and Ramnath, Church of South India. The Bishop spoke at three occasions September 22-23, the last appearance being a public meeting in Hope Memorial Chapel. All of us deeply appreciated his clear insights and forthright discussion on the subject of the Church.

The seminary was shocked and saddened to learn that Professor H. Obendiek, one of our lecturers at the Convocation Conference, and the Rev. Fritz Lierhaus, pastor of the Reformed Church at Artas, South Dakota, and a guest at our conference, were killed in an automobile accident in South Dakota only a week after they left us. We commend the bereaved families and churches to the sustaining grace of God in Jesus Christ our Lord.

We are pleased to note that two of our alumni have received their doctorate degrees since our last issue of the *Bulletin*. The Rev. Thomas Boslooper, '47, pastor of the church at Closter, New Jersey, was granted the Ph.D. degree at Columbia University. The subject of his dissertation was "The Virgin Birth in Modern Criticism." The other Ph.D. degree was conferred by New York University on the Rev. Jerome de Jong, '44, pastor of First Englewood Church, Chicago. The subject of his dissertation was "The Parent-Controlled Christian School."

lory
e of
his
the

ning
Arti-
52.
the
con-
inty
will
and
with
that
ion-
com-
g a
is is
the

inis-
due
God.
K.

ancil
Rev.
nah,
ions
g in
clear
rch.

Pro-
tion
med
nce,
ly a
ilies
hrist

ived
The
ster,
Jni-
irth
rred
'44,
of
ol."